

Interview Summary

Application No.

09/284,690

Applicant(s)

ROUSSEAU, LOUIS

Examiner

Alexa A. Doroshenk

Art Unit

1764

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Alexa A. Doroshenk.

(3) Megan McCoy.

(2) Dan Hart.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 16 May 2002.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference

c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.

If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 2-4 and 16.

Identification of prior art discussed: Art of Record.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

i) ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview (if box is checked).

Unless the paragraph above has been checked, THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required

Summary of Record of Interview Requirements

Manual of Patent Examining Procedure (MPEP), Section 713.04, Substance of Interview Must be Made of Record

A complete written statement as to the substance of any face-to-face, video conference, or telephone interview with regard to an application must be made of record in the application whether or not an agreement with the examiner was reached at the interview.

Title 37 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) § 1.133 Interviews

Paragraph (b)

In every instance where reconsideration is requested in view of an interview with an examiner, a complete written statement of the reasons presented at the interview as warranting favorable action must be filed by the applicant. An interview does not remove the necessity for reply to Office action as specified in §§ 1.111, 1.135. (35 U.S.C. 132)

37 CFR §1.2 Business to be transacted in writing.

All business with the Patent or Trademark Office should be transacted in writing. The personal attendance of applicants or their attorneys or agents at the Patent and Trademark Office is unnecessary. The action of the Patent and Trademark Office will be based exclusively on the written record in the Office. No attention will be paid to any alleged oral promise, stipulation, or understanding in relation to which there is disagreement or doubt.

The action of the Patent and Trademark Office cannot be based exclusively on the written record in the Office if that record is itself incomplete through the failure to record the substance of interviews.

It is the responsibility of the applicant or the attorney or agent to make the substance of an interview of record in the application file, unless the examiner indicates he or she will do so. It is the examiner's responsibility to see that such a record is made and to correct material inaccuracies which bear directly on the question of patentability.

Examiners must complete an Interview Summary Form for each interview held where a matter of substance has been discussed during the interview by checking the appropriate boxes and filling in the blanks. Discussions regarding only procedural matters, directed solely to restriction requirements for which interview recordation is otherwise provided for in Section 812.01 of the Manual of Patent Examining Procedure, or pointing out typographical errors or unreadable script in Office actions or the like, are excluded from the interview recordation procedures below. Where the substance of an interview is completely recorded in an Examiners Amendment, no separate Interview Summary Record is required.

The Interview Summary Form shall be given an appropriate Paper No., placed in the right hand portion of the file, and listed on the "Contents" section of the file wrapper. In a personal interview, a duplicate of the Form is given to the applicant (or attorney or agent) at the conclusion of the interview. In the case of a telephone or video-conference interview, the copy is mailed to the applicant's correspondence address either with or prior to the next official communication. If additional correspondence from the examiner is not likely before an allowance or if other circumstances dictate, the Form should be mailed promptly after the interview rather than with the next official communication.

The Form provides for recordation of the following information:

- Application Number (Series Code and Serial Number)
- Name of applicant
- Name of examiner
- Date of interview
- Type of interview (telephonic, video-conference, or personal)
- Name of participant(s) (applicant, attorney or agent, examiner, other PTO personnel, etc.)
- An indication whether or not an exhibit was shown or a demonstration conducted
- An identification of the specific prior art discussed
- An indication whether an agreement was reached and if so, a description of the general nature of the agreement (may be by attachment of a copy of amendments or claims agreed as being allowable). Note: Agreement as to allowability is tentative and does not restrict further action by the examiner to the contrary.
- The signature of the examiner who conducted the interview (if Form is not an attachment to a signed Office action)

It is desirable that the examiner orally remind the applicant of his or her obligation to record the substance of the interview of each case unless both applicant and examiner agree that the examiner will record same. Where the examiner agrees to record the substance of the interview, or when it is adequately recorded on the Form or in an attachment to the Form, the examiner should check the appropriate box at the bottom of the Form which informs the applicant that the submission of a separate record of the substance of the interview as a supplement to the Form is not required.

It should be noted, however, that the Interview Summary Form will not normally be considered a complete and proper recordation of the interview unless it includes, or is supplemented by the applicant or the examiner to include, all of the applicable items required below concerning the substance of the interview.

A complete and proper recordation of the substance of any interview should include at least the following applicable items:

- 1) A brief description of the nature of any exhibit shown or any demonstration conducted,
- 2) an identification of the claims discussed,
- 3) an identification of the specific prior art discussed,
- 4) an identification of the principal proposed amendments of a substantive nature discussed, unless these are already described on the Interview Summary Form completed by the Examiner,
- 5) a brief identification of the general thrust of the principal arguments presented to the examiner,
(The identification of arguments need not be lengthy or elaborate. A verbatim or highly detailed description of the arguments is not required. The identification of the arguments is sufficient if the general nature or thrust of the principal arguments made to the examiner can be understood in the context of the application file. Of course, the applicant may desire to emphasize and fully describe those arguments which he or she feels were or might be persuasive to the examiner.)
- 6) a general indication of any other pertinent matters discussed, and
- 7) if appropriate, the general results or outcome of the interview unless already described in the Interview Summary Form completed by the examiner.

Examiners are expected to carefully review the applicant's record of the substance of an interview. If the record is not complete and accurate, the examiner will give the applicant an extendable one month time period to correct the record.

Examiner to Check for Accuracy

If the claims are allowable for other reasons of record, the examiner should send a letter setting forth the examiner's version of the statement attributed to him or her. If the record is complete and accurate, the examiner should place the indication, "Interview Record OK" on the paper recording the substance of the interview along with the date and the examiner's initials.

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Attorney presented proposed amendments (attached) to the claims. Discussed changing "projections" to "region" and adding limitation reciting "resulting from a difference in diameter between said cylinder and the diameter of the large base of the truncated cone". Also proposed adding a dependent claim wherein said region comprises a conical section between said cylinder and said truncated cone. Examiner indicated that the changes appear to overcome the 102 rejection and appear to be supported by the specification.

Louis J. Knobbe*
Don W. Martens*
Gordon H. Olson*
James B. Bear
Darrell L. Olson*
William B. Bunker
William H. Nieman
Arthur S. Rose
James F. Lesniak
Ned A. Israelson
Drew S. Hamilton
Jerry T. Sewell
John B. Sganga, Jr.
Edward A. Schlatter
Gerard von Hoffmann
Joseph R. Re
Catherine J. Holland
John M. Carson
Karen Vogel Wall
Andrew M. Simpson
Jeffrey L. Van Housen
Daniel E. Altman
Marguerite L. Gunn
Stephen C. Jensen
Vito A. Canuso III
William H. Shreve
Lynda J. Zadra-Symest
Steven J. Nataupsky
Paul A. Stewart
Joseph F. Jennings
Craig S. Summers
AnneMarie Kaiser
Brenton R. Babcock
Thomas F. Smegal, Jr.
Michael H. Trenholm
Diane M. Reed
Ronald J. Schoenbaum
John R. King
Frederick S. Beretta
Nancy W. Vensko
John P. Glezentanner
Adolf S. Akhtar
Ginger R. Drager
Thomas R. Arno
David N. Weiss
Daniel Hart, Ph.D.
Douglas G. Muehlhauser
Lori Lee Yamato

Michael K. Friedland
Dale C. Hunt, Ph.D.
Richard E. Campbell
Paul D. Tripodi II
Stacey R. Halpern
Lee W. Henderson, Ph.D.
Mark M. Abumeri
Jon W. Gurka
John W. Holcomb
Joseph M. Reisman, Ph.D.
Michael L. Fuller
Deborah S. Shepherd
Eric M. Nelson
Mark R. Benedict, Ph.D.
Paul N. Conover
Robert J. Roby
Sabing H. Lee
Karlina A. Dalaney
James J. Mullen III, Ph.D.
Joseph S. Cianfrani
William R. Zimmerman
Glen L. Nuttall
Eric S. Furman, Ph.D.
Tirzah Abé Lowe
Alexander Franco
Sanjivpal S. Gill
Susan Moss Nalland
James W. Mill, M.D.
Rose M. Thlessen, Ph.D.
Michael A. Gulliana
Mark J. Keriz
Rabinder N. Narula
Bruce S. Itchkawitz, Ph.D.
Peter M. Midgley
Thomas S. McClenahan
Michael S. Okamoto
John M. Grover
Mallory K. De Merlier
Irfan A. Lateef
Amy C. Christenson
Sharon S. Ng
Mark J. Gallagher, Ph.D.
David G. Jankowski, Ph.D.
Brian C. Horne
Payson J. LeMelleur
Diana W. Prince
Shella N. Swaroop
Ben A. Katzenellenbogen

Knobbe Martens Olson & Bear

Intellectual Property Law

550 West C Street
Suite 1200
San Diego CA 92101
Tel 619-235-8550
Fax 619-235-0176
knob.com

May 14, 2002

ORIGINAL WILL FOLLOW VIA:

- ☐ Mail
- ☐ Courier
- ☐ International Airmail
- ☐ Hand Delivery
- ☒ Will Not Follow
- ☐ With Enclosures
- ☐ Without Enclosures

Facsimile Transmittal Sheet

Confidentiality Notice:

The documents accompanying this facsimile transmission contain confidential information which may be legally privileged. The information is intended only for the use of the recipient named below. If you have received this facsimile in error, please immediately notify us by telephone to arrange for return of the original documents to us; any disclosure, copying, distribution or the taking of any action in reliance on the contents of this faxed information is strictly prohibited.

TO: Examiner Alexa Doroshenk
FIRM: USPTO
FACSIMILE NO.: (703) 872-9428
FROM: Dan Hart
APPL. NO.: 09/284,690
CLIENT CODE: VANM107.001APC
PAGES: 2 (INCLUDING THIS SHEET)

IF YOU DID NOT RECEIVE ALL OF THE PAGES, PLEASE CALL BACK IMMEDIATELY.

MESSAGE: Attached please find proposed claims for discussion in our telephonic interview on May 16th at 1:00 EDT.

Linda H. Liu
Jeffrey S. Ellsworth
Andrew N. Merickel, Ph.D.
Douglas T. Hudson
David L. Hauser
Kaare D. Larson
James F. Merkenhoff
Scott L. Murray
Roger S. Shang
Andrew M. Douglas
Marc T. Morley
Salima A. Merani, Ph.D.
Sam K. Tahmassebi, Ph.D.
Christy L. Green
Jalal Sadr
Jonathan A. Hyman
Curtiss C. Dossier
Richard A. DeCristofaro
Donna O. Perdue, Ph.D.
Joseph J. Mallon, Ph.D.
Joanna L. Dufek
Thomas P. Krzeminski
Jeffrey A. Birchak
Sean M. Murray
Jason P. Fiorillo
Elenora Niu
Valerie L. Bracken
Samuel K. Simpson
Johnnie F. Kerlee
Jeremy P. Sanders
Ferry D. Oldham
Jerry L. Helmar
Russell M. Jorde
Abraham W. Chuang
Ryan N. Farr
Pui Tong Ho
Erik T. Anderson
John L. Paik
Eric K. Morton
Jesse A. Rothwell
Marc C. Baumgartner
Ray B. Horn
Danielle Klausner
Kyle F. Schlueter
Raphael A. Gullerrez
Demian K. Jackson
Nathan A. Engels

Of Counsel
Jerry R. Sailer
Paul C. Steinhart

Japanese Patent Atty
Katsuhiko Arai
Tomohisa Sugiyama

European Patent Atty
Martin Helebrandt

Korean Patent Atty
Mincheol Kim
Heungsoo Choi

Solicitor (England & Wales)
J. David Evered

Scientists & Engineers
(Non-Lawyers)

Raimond J. Salenicks**
Khurram Rahman, Ph.D.
Jennifer A. Haynes, Ph.D.**
Tommy Y. Nagata
Che S. Chereskin, Ph.D.**
James W. Ausley**
Jennifer Hayes
Kirk E. Pastorian, Ph.D.**
Charles T. Ridgely
Bonny Yeung, Ph.D.
Connie G. Tong, Ph.D.
Suzanne G. Jepson, Ph.D.
David K. Wiggins
Megan M. McCoy
Nira M. Brand
Catherine M. Sanders
Jeffrey A. Hopkins
Tiffany C. Miller
James W. Chang, Ph.D.
Marina L. Gorday, Ph.D.
Ed DesJardins, Ph.D.**
W. Frank Dauver
Lang J. McHardy
Karen J. Lenker
Chris B. Westberg, Ph.D.

* A Professional Corporation
† Also Barrister At Law (Eng & Wales)
** U.S. Patent Agent

620 Newport Center Drive
Sixteenth Floor
Newport Beach, CA 92660
Tel 949-780-0404
Fax 949-780-0404

201 California Street
Suite 1150
San Francisco CA 94111
Tel 415-954-4114
Fax 415-954-4111

1900 Avenue of the Stars
Suite 1425
Los Angeles CA 90067
Tel 310-551-3450
Fax 310-551-3458

3403 Tenth Street
Suite 700
Riverside CA 92501
Tel 951-781-9231
Fax 951-781-4507

Received from < > at 5/14/02 4:24:39 PM [Eastern Daylight Time]

DRAFT -- NOT FOR ENTRY INTO FILE**Proposed Claims for Discussion**

Appl. No. 09/284,690
VANM107.001APC

2. (Amended three times) An apparatus for the pyrolysis of waste comprising a rotating cell formed of a cylinder, said cylinder having a diameter and two ends, in combination with a truncated cone rotating on the same axis, said truncated cone having a large base and a small base, said large base and said small base each having a diameter, [a hopper for charging the waste at one end of said cell, an ash box at the other end of said cell, a recovery chimney, in connection with said cell, for recovering pyrolysis gases from said cell, and a retaining threshold between the cylinder and the truncated cone,] the diameter of said cylinder being larger than the diameter of said large base of said truncated cone and projections extending between said large base of said truncated cone and said end of said cylinder which is adjacent to said large base of said truncated cone, said projections forming a retaining threshold and creating a region of intimate contact of the waste with itself, whereby the waste is converted into coke which is used as fuel in the pyrolysis of the waste, a hopper for charging the waste at one end of said cell, an ash box at the other end of said cell, and a recovery chimney, in connection with said cell, for recovering pyrolysis gases from said cell.

3. (Amended) The apparatus according to Claim 2, wherein the retaining threshold is formed by a difference between the diameter of the cylinder and the diameter of the large base of the truncated cone.

4. (Amended) The apparatus according to Claim 2, wherein the truncated cone further comprises a network of nozzles fed via channels distributing combustion air in a substoichiometric amount, thereby combusting the coke which is used as fuel in the pyrolysis of the waste.

16. (New) An apparatus for the pyrolysis of waste, comprising waste, a rotating cell formed of a cylinder, said cylinder having a diameter and two ends, in combination with a truncated cone rotating on the same axis, said truncated cone having a large base and a small base, said large base and said small base each having a diameter, the diameter of said cylinder being larger than the diameter of said large base of said truncated cone, and projections extending between said large base of said truncated cone and said end of said cylinder which is adjacent to said large base of said truncated cone, said projections forming a retaining threshold and creating a region of intimate contact of the waste with itself whereby the waste is converted into coke which is used as fuel in the pyrolysis of the waste.